



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,438	06/28/2001	Michael Bennett	017887005210	8245
20350	7590	02/03/2006	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			BORLINGHAUS, JASON M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/896,438	BENNETT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason M. Borlinghaus	3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: improper preamble.

Claim 15 states that it is dependent upon “information portal system of Claim 5” (see line 1). However, Claim 5 is for “information portal logic.” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 5 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 5 – 15, directed to information portal logic, and Claims 16 – 19, directed to computer program product, appear to be computer programs. Computer programs per se are not statutory. They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not “acts” being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program’s functionality to be realized. See § 2106 IV. B. 1. (a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Disclosed Prior Art (applicant's specification), Shea (Shea, Richard. *L2TP: Implementation and Operation. Addison-Wesley Professional*. Reading, MA. September 24, 1999. p. 191), Haverstock (US Patent 6,343,607) and Chapman (Chapman, D. Brent & Zwicky, *Elizabeth D. Building Internet Firewalls*. O'Reilly & Associates. 1995. pp. 45 – 47).

Regarding Claim 1 - 4, Disclosed Prior Art discloses an information portal system comprising:

- a portal server (stand-in system) including logic to authenticate a user logging onto the portal server (portal user authentication data) to access user data (financial data) received at least in part from a server of an institution (financial institution servers). ("To set up a stand-in arrangement, the user sets up an account with a portal operator, including portal user authentication data, such as a user ID and password that authenticates the user to the portal." – see p. 2);
- logic for initiating establishment of a portal-institution interface (connection) over which the portal server may authenticate with the institution using authentication data (financial institution authentication

data). (“The user then provides the portal operator with all the financial institution authentication data the user uses to connect to the financial institution servers and an indication of the financial institution (e.g., domain name, URL, or IP address). The portal operator stores the user's financial institution authentication data at its servers. When the user makes a request for information from the portal, the portal server connects to the financial institution server and, using the user authentication data, logs on as the user and gets the information it needs.” – see specification, page 2. “Consequently, there is a risk that if a database of user IDs and passwords stored at the portal is compromised, the attacker could then access many users' financial institution accounts and even make transactions on those accounts.” – see p. 3);

- logic at the portal server to perform on the user's data an action (information retrieval) selected from a first set of actions. (“When the user makes a request for information from the portal, the portal server connects to the financial institution server and, using the user authentication data, logs on as the user and gets the information it needs.” – see specification, page 2);
- wherein the institution is a financial institution. (see p. 2);
- wherein the user data is financial transaction information. (“When the user makes a request for information from the portal, the portal server connects to the financial institution server and, using the user authentication data,

logs on as the user and gets the information it needs." – see specification, p. 2); and

- further comprising the server of the institution, the server of the institution comprising logic for retaining the user ID (user authentication data) as a validated user ID (user authentication data) and associating the validated user ID (user authentication data) with a user account at the institution to which the user data (financial data) pertains, and logic for authenticating the user (user authentication data), by providing the validated user ID (user authentication ID), may access the user data (financial data). (see p. 2).

Disclosed Prior Art does not teach an information portal system comprising:

- logic for initiating establishment of a portal-institution interface over which the portal server may authenticate with the institution using portal authentication data;
- wherein the actions performed on the user data by the portal are actions selected from a second set of actions that is a subset of the first set of actions;
- the first set of actions includes conducting a financial transaction and the second set of actions includes viewing user data but the second set of actions does not include conducting financial transactions; and
- further comprising the server of the institution, the server of the institution comprising logic for retaining the user portal ID as a validated user portal

ID and associating the validated user portal ID with a user account at the institution to which the user data pertains, and logic for authenticating the portal server, by providing the validated user portal ID may access the user portal data.

Authentication of an entity, person and/or device, at the time of connection to a system and prior to providing access to resources of said system is old and well known in the art of computer security, as evidenced by Shea which states "Connection authentication refers to the act of authenticating an entity when a connection is first made." It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art to incorporate the ability for the institution to authenticate a connecting entity, as disclosed by Shea, in general, and by Disclosed Prior Art, utilizing user authentication data, to ensure said connecting entity, regardless of its nature, has valid authorization to access said system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art and Shea to allow for any identification that the inventor desired for authentication purposes, such authentication based upon user ID, portal ID, computer ID or IP address ID. *In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 555, 188 USPQ 7, 9 (CCPA 1975)*.

Providing different users of a system with different levels of access and allowing them different subsets of actions on the system, such as through a least privilege designation or through role-based security, is old and well known in the art of computer and network security, as evidenced by Haverstock which discloses a web-based server

utilizing a role-based security system, stating "The system also provides role-based, multi-level security module 40 for controlling access to objects within the system. The system enables an authorized individual to assign users a defined role. Each role may have various privileges based on the priority level of the role. Priority levels may comprise a read only privilege, read and edit privileges, read public information only privileges, etc." (see col. 5, lines 56 – 62).

Furthermore, Chapman discloses the use of least privilege designations for network security purposes, stating "Basically, the principle of least privilege means that any object (user, administrator, program, system, whatever) should have only the privileges the object needs to perform its assigned tasks – and no more...In the Internet context, the examples are endless. Every user probably doesn't need to access every Internet service. Every user probably doesn't need to modify (or even read) every file on your system...Applying the principle of least privilege suggests that you should explore ways to reduce the privileges required for various operations." (see p. 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art and Shea by incorporating commonly known security measures, such as the least privilege principle, role-based security or access control lists, as disclosed by Haverstock and Chapman, to limit the portal server's actions on the institution server to a subset of the total actions that the user, him/herself, could employ on the institution server, as the portal server would be deemed a non-trusted third party and not the user, him/herself.

In particular, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Haverstock and Chapman to have limited the portal server, in the role of non-trusted third party, to access and retrieve user information, the least privilege required as an information portal, and not allowing the portal server to act or authorize transactions based upon that user information, as such activities would be outside its scope as an information portal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified access privileges for the portal server to allow for any access privileges that the inventor desired, such as limited portal server access to certain account information and/or documents, and/or performance of certain actions.

In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 555, 188 USPQ 7, 9 (CCPA 1975).

Regarding Claims 5 – 7, further logic claims would have been obvious from system claims rejected above, Claims 1 – 3, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Regarding Claim 16, further product claim would have been obvious from system claim rejected above, Claims 1 – 3, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Claims 8 – 9, 14 – 15 and 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock and Chapman, as applied to Claims 5 and 16 above, and further in view of Bezos (US Patent 6,029,141).

Regarding Claims 8 – 9, Disclosed Prior Art discloses a logic:

- wherein the user is provided an opportunity (via browser) to authenticate with the institution using user authentication information. (see p. 3).

Disclosed Prior Art does not teach a logic:

- further comprising user interface logic for providing a reference to a web page associated with the institution so that the user by following the reference may initiate the arranged accessibility; and
- wherein the reference includes a user portal ID, and upon following the reference, the user is provided an opportunity to authenticate with the institution using user authentication information, and after authentication the institution retains the user portal ID as a portion of the portal authentication data.

Bezos discloses a logic:

- further comprising user interface logic (graphic user interface) for providing a reference (hyperlink) to a web page associated with the institution (merchant) so that the user by following the reference (hyperlink) may initiate the arranged input of information (completion of order form). (see col 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 18); and
- wherein the reference includes a user portal ID (associate ID), and upon following the reference (hyperlink), the user is provided an opportunity to input information (completion of order form), and after input of information the institution (merchant) retains the user portal ID (associate ID) as a

portion of the portal (associate) authentication data. (see col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 18 and col. 11, lines 15 – 26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock and Chapman by incorporating the ability to utilize a user interface logic and a reference to a web page associated with the institution for input of user information, as disclosed by Bezos, allowing for ease of access to the institution for input of user data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos by incorporating the ability for the institution to retain the user portal ID, which was included as part of the reference, as portal authentication data, as disclosed by Bezos, allowing for ease of submission of user portal ID for retention by institution.

Regarding Claim 14, Disclosed Prior Art discloses a logic wherein:

- the logic for initiating enrollment of the user (user sets up account with a portal operator) on the portal system. (see p. 2, lines 17 – 25);
- providing user authentication information (via portal operator) to the institution, initiates the arranged accessibility. (see p. 2, lines 17 – 25); and
- providing user authentication information to the institution (user logs onto financial institution system), initiates the arranged accessibility. (see p. 3, lines 7 – 11).

Disclosed Prior Art does not teach a logic wherein:

- the logic to authenticate is operable to interface with user interface logic for initiating enrollment of the user upon a determination that the user does not have a valid account on the portal system, and to provide a reference to a webpage associated with the institution so that the user, by following the reference, and providing user authentication information to the institution, initiates the arranged accessibility.

Bezos discloses a logic wherein:

- the logic is operable to interface with user interface logic (graphic user interface). (see col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 18); and
- to provide a reference to a webpage (hyperlink) with the institution (merchant) so that the user, by following the reference (hyperlink), may initiate the arranged input of information (completion of order form). (see col 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos by incorporating the ability to utilize a user interface logic and a reference to a web page associated with the institution for input of user information, as disclosed by Bezos, allowing for ease of access to the institution for input of user data.

Official notice has been taken that it is old and well known within customer relations and customer management to register of new customers, members and/or users for a service and/or product upon determination that said individuals has not yet been registered for said service and/or product. Such a procedure has been utilized to

register non-subscribers for newspaper delivery, sign up new customers for new banking accounts and solicit non-customers for cable television service. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos by incorporating the initiation of enrollment of the user upon determination that the user does not have a valid account on the system, as is old and well known, to allow registration of new users to the service.

Regarding Claim 15, Disclosed Prior Art discloses an information portal logic wherein:

- the logic to authenticate is operable to establish a trusted connection between the portal server and the server of the institution of the institution using the user authentication data (logs on as user). (see p. 2, lines 17 – 25); and
- further comprising logic to provide for reception of the user data (gets the information it needs) over the trusted connection. (see p. 2, lines 17 – 25);
- through one or more user initiated requests (user makes a request for information). (see p. 2, lines 17 – 25).

Disclosed Prior Art does not teach a logic wherein:

- the logic to authenticate is operable to establish a trusted connection between the portal server and the server of the institution of the institution using the portal data, and further comprising logic to provide for reception

of the user data over the trusted connection, through one or more batch requests and user initiated requests.

Authentication of an entity, person and/or device, at the time of connection to a system and prior to providing access to resources of said system is old and well known in the art of computer security, as evidenced by Shea which states "Connection authentication refers to the act of authenticating an entity when a connection is first made." It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos to incorporate the ability for the institution to authenticate a connecting entity, as disclosed by Shea, in general, and by Disclosed Prior Art, utilizing user authentication data, to ensure said connecting entity, regardless of its nature, has valid authorization to access said system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos to allow for any identification that the inventor desired for authentication purposes, such authentication based upon user ID, portal ID, computer ID or IP address ID. *In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 555, 188 USPQ 7, 9 (CCPA 1975).*

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the computer science arts to perform batch requests and/or batch processing. This processing method has been utilized to conserve processing and bandwidth resources by grouping multiple items for transmission and/or processing at one time. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos by incorporating the ability to batch

requests for information, as is old and well known, to conserve processing and bandwidth resources.

Regarding Claims 17 – 19, further product claims would have been obvious from method claims, Claims 8 – 9, and logic claims, Claims 14 – 15, rejected above and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Claims 10 - 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos, as applied to Claim 9 above, and further in view of Keyes (Keyes, Jessica. *Banking Technology Handbook*. CRC Press. 1999. pp. 5-1 and 20-17).

Regarding 10 – 11, Disclosed Prior Art discloses a logic:

- wherein the user is provided an opportunity (via browser) to authenticate with the institution using user authentication information. (see p. 3).

Disclosed Prior Art does not teach a logic:

- wherein the user interface logic is further for providing the user an opportunity to authenticate the user portal ID with a plurality of institutions; and
- wherein the user interface logic further for providing the opportunity to authenticate the plurality of institutions by providing a separate reference for each of the plurality of institutions, each separate reference containing user portal ID.

Bezos discloses a logic:

- wherein the user interface logic (graphic user interface) is further for providing the user an opportunity (via hyperlink) to authenticate the user portal ID (associate ID) with an institution (merchant). (see col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 18 and col. 11, lines 15 – 26); and
- wherein the user interface logic (graphic user interface) further for providing the opportunity to authenticate with an institution (merchant) by providing a separate reference (hyperlink) for each of the plurality of products (product IDs), each separate reference (referral hyperlink) containing user portal ID (associate ID). (see col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 18 and col. 11, lines 15 – 26).

Combining “content from multiple sources onto one computer desktops” and, thereby, a need to access multiple sources for said content is old and well known in the art of banking technology, as evidenced by Keyes which states “Asset consolidation will become one of the key features that users require on the Internet. Asset consolidation refers to the ability to consolidate account information from multiple financial institutions for the purposes of analysis, making decisions and taking action.” (see pp. 5-1 and 20-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman and Bezos by incorporating the ability to access multiple financial institutions for content, as disclosed by Keyes, allowing for consolidation of information from a plurality of financial institutions in one location.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman, Bezos and Keyes by incorporating the ability to provide a separate reference for each of the plurality of institutions, each separate reference containing user portal ID, in the same manner as Bezos discloses a separate reference for each of the plurality of products, each separate reference containing user portal ID, allowing for simplified access to the institution by the user for input of user data and ease of submission of user portal ID for retention by institution.

Regarding Claims 12 – 13, Disclosed Prior Art discloses a logic:

- possession of a plurality of separate accounts at the institution (see p. 1, line 30 – p. 2, line 1); and
- wherein the user is provided an opportunity (via browser) to authenticate with the institution using user authentication information. (see p. 3, line 7 - 17).

Neither Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock nor Chapman teach a logic:

- wherein the user interface logic is further providing the user an opportunity to associate an opportunity to associate the user portal ID with a plurality of separate accounts at the institution.
- wherein the user interface logic provides the opportunity to authenticate for the plurality of separate accounts providing for the user to follow the reference a plurality of times, each time the user to authenticate with the

institution using different user authentication data, and for each of the plurality of times, the reference to contain the user portal ID.

Bezos discloses a logic:

- wherein the user interface logic (graphic user interface) is further providing the user an opportunity (via hyperlink) to associate the user portal ID (associate ID) with a plurality of separate products at the institution (merchant). (see col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 18 and col. 11, lines 15 – 26); and
- wherein the user interface logic (graphic user interface) provides the opportunity to authenticate for the plurality of separate products for the user to follow the reference a plurality of times (plurality of purchases), each time the user with an institution (merchant) by providing a separate reference for each of the plurality of products (product IDs), each separate reference (referral hyperlink) containing user portal ID (associate ID).

Combining “content from multiple sources onto one computer desktops” and, thereby, a need to access multiple sources for said content is old and well known in the art of banking technology, as evidenced by Keyes which states “Asset consolidation will become one of the key features that users require on the Internet. Asset consolidation refers to the ability to consolidate account information from multiple financial institutions for the purposes of analysis, making decisions and taking action.” (see pp. 5-1 and 20-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman

Art Unit: 3628

and Bezos by incorporating the ability to access multiple accounts for content, as disclosed by Keyes, allowing for consolidation of information from a plurality of accounts in one location.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the cryptography and banking arts to require authentication for access to different accounts using different user authentication data for each account, such as passwords, PINs and/or account numbers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman, Bezos and Keyes by incorporating the submission of different user authentication data in order to access different accounts, as is old and well known, allowing for consolidation of information from a plurality of financial sources in one location.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art, Shea, Haverstock, Chapman, Bezos, and Keyes by incorporating the ability to provide a separate reference for each of the plurality of accounts, each separate reference containing user portal ID, in the same manner as Bezos discloses a separate reference for each of the plurality of products, each separate reference containing user portal ID, allowing for simplified access to the account by the user for input of user data and ease of submission of user portal ID for retention by institution.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/14/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejection under § 103, the applicant argues that Disclosed Prior Art does not teach all the limitations of Claim 1, specifically that Claim 1 claims "the portal system authenticates the portal system to the institution server" while Disclosed Prior Art, cited in the Office Action, discloses "the portal server connects to the financial institution server and, using the user authentication data, logs on as the user and gets the information it needs."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "authentication through use of portal authentication data") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 3628

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Borlinghaus whose telephone number is (571) 272-6924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/896,438
Art Unit: 3628

Page 21



HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600